Dear Paul, 4/3/73

~~Dxxxxxxxxx~~ Your letter of the 28th came yesterday. I read it then and will skim through it again. For the most part I find it non-responsive or evasive, while in some parts superficially reasonable. If there are some things you prefer not to address, there is nothing I can do about that.

After Jim told me you were preparing to spend a year on what can be describes without unkindness as either a futility or an ego trip, I did, as I wrote you, give that some thought. I made a short memo on it, started a separate file on your book because I did expect we'd have correspondence on it, and will take the carbon from that file and send it with this.

Interpret my setting up a separate file for this any way you want. I think you would err to decide that it was prompted by not expecting to try to help you, as you would to believe that this or any of the letters you did not like in the past were motivated by anything personal or personal about you.

It is inevitable that strong-willed, intelligence people will disagree. What is not inevitable, given mutual willigness, is that there can't be reasonable resolution of differences. You know I was opposed to CTIA from the first. Their record validated all my fears. If I erred in trusting Bud personally, I did. Yet yesterday Bob Smith was here the entire day working on my Farewell America files. He will return to complete this. Ican work with him. This was on my initiative. I made the offer several months ago. He then did not see what he should have. When, belatedly, he did, and was embarrassed at making the request, when I found out about it I extended the offer again. He also finds that my instincts, in addition to my reasoning, were sound. Bud and I barely talk to eachother. If you knew all that had transpired, you'd wonder that I have anything to do with him. Yet when he has need, I help. I have never stopped working with Jim, who is coming up this evening and staying over night to work on different things. When Jim was out there and Bud couldn't consult with me through him, he wrote and asked me to phone him, I did, we consulted, he asked that we get together on Jim's return for other consultations, we did, and we reached amicable agreement. There are many other such cases. I don't think anyone would accept what Salandria did in May of 1966, to me and to WHITEWASH. My wife has not since been able to abide him. It was utterly unconscionable. But when it was necessary to work with him, as at least three times thereafter it was, I did, and in each instance, what had to be done was accomplished.

So, disputes are not strange to me. Surmounting them is not impossible. However, it requires that both parties be willing or that one be a manipulator. My days of manipulation ended in New Orleans. I'll not relive a lonely nightmare like that again.

I look back, in fact, upon a rather large number of such disputes, some fairly violent, several with you. I can recall not one in which you either agreed with me or did anything to help if you did agree. Not can I recall a <u>single</u> one in which I was wrong. This is more sickening than comforting, for it tells me not that I am so excellent in my judgement but that others are so deplorably bad. From that no reasonable man can take comfort. There is not, really, any balm for an ego in it. It is, rather, depressing when people are engaged upon serious work. And it has taken an enormous amount of time for which I had other and productive uses, work I was not able to do because of them.

When ethical and moral considerations entered - and I'm pretty old-fashioned in these things - despite deep affections, I severed all connections except, in two cases, for a fatherly rather than a motherly effort to fend against what these young men might in the future face. With Gary, about whom I did feel likema father and my wife felt as a mother, because of Ned and his parts in that fiasco that was so painful to us, I fiest asked him to comment on what Wise and Ross said about the foundation on whose board he sits and about Katzenbach, who also sits on that board. When Gary was silent I sent him photocopies. When he remained silent, I felt I had met my obligations and I have sent him nothing else. You may be too young to recognize the emotion, but when you get to 60 you will better understand. When the young, who complain about the inflexibility of their elders, are stubborn, it become impossible for them to learn from the experiences of those who have lived them. I am the product or experiences I hope you never have. If they were costly, they gave me

an education not obtainable in any university. They and the record in this many disputes tend to give me assurance on my judgements. In some I have been pretty much alone. It appears that with one exception, Howard, none of you have been able to learn from this.

Nor have you been willing to do the scholarly thing of re-examining your own record in these things. If you had a less brilliant mind, this would be easier to understand. However, when your are unusually gifted and have this mind mind to which an excellent scientific education has been added, I ask myself why is this? I tell myself that there are always things that the indivudual character each of us has causes. And I know only too well what emotions and desires can do. I know that the quietest have emotions, sometimes the deepest. These pull strong enough to overcome the logic of the mind.

If your peroration was designed as a self-justification, I do not find justification in it. I do not doubt you do and that you find it reasonable.

That you take my letter as intended as abuse also tells mt that your reaction is emotional. I am not a sadist, and I don't take such time for self-indulgence. If I had felt the way you seem to take it, I'd just have been silent. However, I will not take that much time again. Your failure to confront so much of it and your unintended admissions about others are the reason. I will take time, but I will not knowingly waste it.

I find your description of frustration in refraining from responding to my "version of some issues" unpersuasive and an unintended cloak for your inability to do this. You are not inarticulate and are the opposite of unintelligent. You are wrong in thinking it is something I will "hold against ~~y~~ you. This is not a matter for debating points, not, at least, as I see it. Issues are to be confronted. That is how they are resolved. The Jewish mother figure may strike you are cute. My reaction is that it is but another evasion. You are not referring to what is real, an avuncular attitude. That also would be irrelevant if you had it in mind.

If you need more than what actually came to pass on the Ned-Cyril operation, you need too much. If you haven't learned from that, you are incapable of letting your mind dominate emotions or whatever else controls. My own record on that is one that in an intelligence operation would have earned all sorts of honors. I don't recall the detail in which I kept you informed. Howard, however, will tell you, because he was here and overheard the conversation, that I even forecast to Fred Graham long before it came to pass exactly the form his story would take. Hindsight could not have been moreprecise than foresight. I was also accurate in saying that Cyril would find nothing from his, if you'll excuse the word, "examination", than we already knew.

I think it is past time for you to face some of your own judgements, for that is what is involved here, not this Jewish-mother crap. On Cyril, what was it? One formulation was so what, you didn't want to be bothered. Nothing to it. Need I remind you that after you read the executive sessions you described them as the mouthings of a bunch of old ladies gathered for kaffe-klatches (your word)? At 60 I am less inflexible than you at less than half this age. I test my judgements. I do make mistakes, by the way. Most of them come from excessive trust.

I have lived and worked with these people and forces we confront. Of all of us, I alone have had these experiences. You and others prefer to ignore this. I think you are also secretly resentful when it turns out that I am right.

In reminding you of some of your own attitudes, I am not intending embarrassment. I think it is past time for you to face your own record in such matters and I am saying that it is I, not you, who stands on a firm foundation. Yourreluctance to confront, now as in the past, is not from confronting Jewish motherdom. If comes from confronting what you will not, your judgemental record, and what you will not, mine. There is nothing I can do about this. Except seek to isolate myself from its consequences. When people work in the same field, this is never really possible. All one can do is diminish. That I was opposed to what Cyril and Ned did did not prevent it nor did it diminish the consequences. The consequences, in fact, were worse for me.

So much for generalities. I will have to suspend for a while. I don't want to forget one touchstone in all of this recent stuff. I made a general statement and a prediction of the probable with regard to commemorating the 10th anniversary. I gave you a means of getting an unprejudiced, professional judgement. If you had consulted with Jim White I'm sure one

of you would have told me. Why would you not? He is an experience man. And he is sympathetic to our view? There may be bother reasons, but the most obvious one to me is that you will not confront your own judgemental error. We can't predict the future with 100% accuracy, but we have a record to draw upon and can be fairly certain about probabilities.

Instead, you make a strange reference to Sylvia and the Belin counter-productivity. If there is nothing we can do to prevent such things, it is folly to entice them. In that case the times already had its regular sycophancy arranged. It used it. Belin was their lily-gilding. They did not miss the chance Sylvia gave them, with nothing of any real value to us at any time possible in any part of that childish futility.

I can hardly wrestele with this generality about obe of the points that approaches the specific in your letter, that "the way" I "put her [Sylvia's] down her Belin stuff is unworthy of" me.

My attitudes on such trivial, out-dated projects hasn't changed in years. I hew the Ecclesiastes line about times and places. I have no objection to such studies if one wants to leave them as a matter of historical record. But for publication? Where 28 people who couldn't really care less may see it? And where it is a direct challenge that invites those who can be and are heard to use what is always available to them? Can't we ever learn about how these things work? There was a t ime when I was all for publication of small studies-back in 1966. That was eons ago in this work and the popular and official attitudes toward it. I encouraged Ray Marcus and tried be be helpful, but his is such inordinate genius help was impossible. So, he issued a sterility that was boring except to the iniated, to whom it told nothing.

I have a record on this Sylvia/Belin matter. There is a witness if you doubt my word. I knew about it and read it prior to publication, as I did Belin's proposed response, I think. Howard was turned on by it. He started his own efforts. Aside from a general feeling that this should have been left to the initiator, unless there was a request for help - in this you should find me consistent - I was opposed to it for the above reasons and others. Howard will tell you how I advised him, whether or not I made a prediction, and whether or not it was accurate. I think but I can't now be sure that I also suggested how he should go about it if he persisted, against my advice. Here again I do not present myself as omniscient or holier than the pope. Howard and I disagreed strongly on the Cyril adventure. At no time did I lean on him to agree with me or abandon his own efforts of the course upon which he had decided. I spent long hours counselling him on how to preserve his integrity in what I was certain would be the disaster it was and how he might best accomplish what he conceived possible. Here again, this is not an exceptional case. I regarded Nichols as a nut and a crook and a hazard. But I spent a great amount of time trying to protect himself from his own ignorance and arrogance. You have copies. Perhaps after the passing of time you can regard the effort I made with your meolnry in a similar light? If you are unwilling to, can you conceive of any other rational explanation of the time I took on that? Inherent, of course, inall these things is the common interest as I at any time see it.

Now Sylvia's is a towering intellect. She is articulate as few can ever hope to be. But she is and has been almost since I first met her the captive of uncontrolable emotions. For years I ignored them, despite what I kept hearing and what I couldn't avoid seeing. In her mind she is truly dedicated. In mine she is galled by two things: that her great work was dated when it finally emerged and made no real contribution (a tragedy for all of us) and her inability to add to that. Yet she had, as she knew, this great mind, and had done that wonderful book. This was one futility too many for her. She was not content to do those things within her capability because she is also very stingy. Those things she neither did nor conceived of doing. She regarded herself as the queen to whom all deference and respect were automatically due, who should be permitted to direct the course of events not because she was so wise, informed and understanding but simply because of her self-concept, and she intruded herself upon them, in each case bringing a disaster down upon us. Of what utility is a great mind with this record? For years I deferred to the emotional problems that were soon enough visible in her and before long beyond question, partly for compassionate reasons, partly to avoid further disunity. There has to be an end of such things.

Just because she called you some kind of agent doesn t mean you are at the top of her shit list, as you call it. You don t really understand her yet.

Your are correct in saying that I discussed the Memo of Transfer thing with you, as I wrote you. He got twisted. I did not have that in mind and knew nothing of any such efforts when I spoke to him. What I knew came in your letter to which I responded.

However, the error is not in my "interpretation" but in your communication. Please go over what you wrote me. You will find not only nothing like what you now say but not even a remote inference of it. If you had any mature feeling of social responsibility in this entire thing you would not have failed to inform me fully. I regard my strong reaction as more than proper. I regard it as required. Unless you want to abdicate to the nuts and personally-ambitious entirely. I don't- and won't. You reflect your own attitude that I regard as irresponsible in a man of your years and intellect in this sentence,"I still do not see how I can be expected to tell him this should not be done." It surely isn't that you can't see. It is that you refuse to. This is your right, but it is neither mature nor responsible. You prefer to toys with the nuts and cater to them, for all the world as though something good can be expected of them. That also is your right. You prefer to ignore their long records, and none can take that right from you. At some point you will come face to face with the consequences, and you will then be uncomfortable and, painfully, will come to understand wherein you have been irresponsible.

Longago the time for separating men and boys was passed. We are so tiny a corporal's guard reducing the number still further is no liability when the elimination is of the zanies and there are some advantages. Such as not having to wipe adult asses and diaper adult minds.

It is true that I have my own interests in mind. But it is not true that they dominate my ctions. I have exhausted my remedies on many things, including the Memo. But when filing a Complaint is a simple matter, particularly so with that one, I have not. When Bud suddenly got encouraged a long time ago and asked me to draft more Complaints and said he'd file the cases, I did not. I also explained why to Jim, not to Bud. I practise my own preaching. I think I addressed reasons enough on this onw to you. I know I did one number with Jim, and he agreed. This was all in terms of our best capabilities and prospects. In every case I have something unique that amounts to a considerable in-court advantage.

There are, obviously, a large number of such requests that can be made. Why others have to look for crumbs behind me when there are so many I can't easily explain to myself and you have avoided it entirely. Also quite consistently, for this is hardly the first time I've raised both the question and a general approach to resolutions.

I did not say blanket that priority in time should be the determining factor. I said it should be the ultimate one if there was no other basis for agreement. The one on which you have not responded is the suppressed ex. sess. transcript you knew I'd been working on before you recognized what was in them and you knew of all my written efforts because I gave you copies, both ways. I have raised this question with you often. You have not once responded. I can t keep you from whatever bullheaded course you determine to follow and after this I won't. But your persisting failure to recollect when I have raised this question repeatedly is discomforting to me.

You have come to maturity in the most amoral time in out history. I have a more ancient view of what is right and wrong, moral and immoral, ethical and unethical. You have been a shcolar in an environment in which there is a premium on plagiarism, and your own a titudesmay have been shaped by this. You live with that. You are now mature. You should have standards of your own. It has now become a cliche to accuse me of attempting to exert proprietary rights to the Archives. If you want to salve your receeded conscience with this, deceive yourself. I'll give you two example to cope with. I have no intention of making this slefdeception easy for you. I have too mucy respect for you and have had perhaps too much liking. You damned well know how much I gave Garrison to use in his special abortion. It is the one good that came of it. I gave him the entire God Damned book. I did precisely that with the Hallack case, where that great Gyril was as stupid as he was blind. I then had two books done and I have them both away. This is exercising some kind of restrictive property right? How can you kid yourself in this juvenile way?

On my last trip to New Orleans and Dallas I made significant advances in knowledge. Did I keep them secret? Did I not, in fact, write you in long-hand, laboriously, telling you what I had learned so the knowledge could help you in your work? If I'm not mistaken I did this once on an airplane and at least once instead of sleeping. This is some new kind of selfishness?

Dallas is and was besset by monumental incompetence. I went there and opened up two whole damned archies to us. I then made arrangements for Mary to have unrestricted access to them. That she has not done a thing or if she has had kept it secret is immaterial except as a measure of what we can expect of her and them. But is this also some of this new-fangled selfishness you attribute to me? I also got some things in New Orleans that I had been trying to get without success for years. I trusted her with them when I hadn't even had time to go over them. 17months have passed and I haven't been able to retrieve these things. This makes me selfish and Mary pure and unselfish, I suppose?

Howard will tell you that I have given him boxes of files and offered him more. He comes her, as Jerry and everyone else did, and rummages unwatched through all I have. Jerry turned out to be a crook in addition to the other things I alleged. Many of my files and pictures are missing. We discovered he had some by accident and after he denied it when he got careless and Jim asked him to duplicate some of this work. He then coughed up what he had stolen from me, some in the original envelopes still. This, too, makes me selfish. And, of course, the errant one.

On my previous trip to Dallas I took Penn on every interview on which he would go. I found what he couldn't, and he was in on every minute and word. Proprietary interest? Yet Penn was there, lived there, and had failed from simple incompetence. There are, as you should know, many similar cases in California.

You and the others who say such things may kid yourselves with such childish nonsense, but I'm not helping you.

Between us, not only did I encourage you to do a competitive book, but I gave you all I had written to read. When I learnedthat you seemed to be getting to the point of writing I suggested that you begin by going over my relevant files. Tell me what kind of selfishness this is, how self-seeking it proves me to be!

Now I know your evaluation that there can now be no commercial interest in the subject is correct because I used those chapter to submit to a major publisher. There was strong enditorial approval. But the whole thing was rejected. Today there is a legitimate commercial basis for this. I think it unlikely that any book can pay its own way, except fiction. In this case I even had friends in court. It was to no avail. However, when your attitude was accurately reflected to me, I thought through what you should have for you. You may or may not agree with my recommendation, but I am persuaded that it can be a viable book, can be something other than a futility, and in any event had one great merit: it will not be a redundancy. There is so much, must we duplicate? Can't there, with so vast a subject, be real,original work?

I think my suggestion has other merit, one being the probability, given willingness, of eliminating needless conflict.

Once for for the last time I'm trying to confront all your misrepresentations that I think are slef-deceptions from below the level of consciousness. "I do not think you can expect me to refrain from working on, or writing about, some topic just before you have worked on or written on it before"(sic). I hate to load so much on poor Howard, but he will certainly tell you he knows this is bullshit. The record between you and me on this also proves this. I have regularly worked with others on the same thing. Sometimes, as Howard will also tell you, I have taken the iniative in asking this. On the other hand, there are things that have interested you and me both, where I have withdrawn in deference to you. Quiroga comes to mind immediately. Even when you have come in behind me. (544 Camp.) Nor is it a question of what has "been raised". God knows Garrison "raised" enough. Stop twisting things to yourself.

Your representation of my position on a separate article on the Kennedys is so great a distortion I find it hard to accept as accidental, not with your mind. I am unsympathetic to anything that requires a context it can't have in any presentation, to anything that further buries truth, to anything that helps defeat us. If you want to join

the anti-Kennedy cabal and seek relief from your frustrations this way, go ahead. You are talking about nothing else. My own position has been unchanged from the first. You heard it often enough beginning with my first trip to California. That was not by any means my first enunciation. It is one of the things the vindictive ones have always held against me, the more so because they have no factual basis for their prejudices.

I am not aware of any argument against publication that you have ever made. This is one of the points I have tried to make. You may have had some minor misgivings about some topics. No more.

Despite your effort to confuse publication on this subject with that on scientific subjects, you have not addressed the basis of my objections, including ego-tripping and the real danger of counter-productive ends.

You should realize that you come close to admitting ego-tripping when you admit you are "aiming" at a "limited audience". What is the unique merit of this limited audience that you prefer it to one that might make a difference?

The disadvantages of ~~xxxx~~ even a "thoroughly researched piece" on Davison include two: standing by itself it means nothing (and can detract from a work in which it should be an integral part, as it can diminish the prospects of that work at a time when it can be acceptable; it compels an end to official carelessness on this subject and assures further destruction and covering-up. In general, I oppose doing anything by way of publication in the present environment unless there is prospect of some accomplishment. I have not only said this, I have practised it. I could give you different kinds of illustrations. Perhaps one will suffice. The Washington Post has an international reputation for its sensational disclosures on the Watergate affair. Yet they have suppressed an enormous amount of significant information to my personal knowledge and as recently as less than a week ago. I have been sending him White clippins of their stories. He is experienced and an exceptionally good analyst. I am certain he'll tell you that their reporting is almost entirely restricted to what has been leaked to them and that he can find countless leads in what they have printed that, by normal journalistic standards, cry out for following. I can't think of a single one they have followed. You detached yourself from me, not the other way around, so you are unaware of what I have geiven them. Some is as sensational as antything they have printed. Some of the very promising leads can very well lead to what is much more sensational.

Or, stop knocking your head against the wrong wall at the wrong time. There is a simple rule of spookdom I have in the past tried to get you to think about: don't do what doesn't hold promise of some kind of success.

On your efforts to get suppressed LHO files you give me what was in your mind, not what was in your letter and not the way they will use your letter.

There is no doubt that the Commission's refusal to do the necessary and obvious with the FBI's LHO files is wrong, unconscionable, treacherous, anything you want to say. In 1960 that would have been a viable approach. At this late date it is an exculpation of Hoover and the FBI to take that approach. You surely know the care with which he boxed them in. You do this know and your be doing more than the futility of whipping a dead horse: you'll become part of the now-Nixonian drive to authoritarianism.

You would have been well-advised to begin with specific, individual things, like the Worker interception. When I realized this I junked more work than it would have required to write three of four rough drafts of books and what for me was much cost. It takes up a fairly large proportion of an entire file drawer. We have to learn about changing circumstances and change with them.

My analysis of the DJ's new rules is something Jim and I have not had a chance to discuss. He'll be here this evening but I will not regard that as priority among the things for us to consider. What you should do here is not interpret their semantics the way you want to but as you think they intended in their formulations. I had forgotten that you had sent him a copy and didn't make a carbon. However, I'll lend him mine. I think that any reactivation of an old and rejected request could be properly rejected on that basis alone. I think you'd need something new. Or, don't shoot your bolt without need and without prospect.

This is another example of your non-thinking, of what I have called immaturity and caused your resentment. I show little respect for you in pussy-footing around such things, I do respect young so I am blunt.

It should be obvious that you have to consider what would happen if this went to court. You renew a rejected request you did nothing about when rejected. What will be the DJ's first claim to that court, and how will almost any court react? How do you think you would react if you were a man who in all likelyhood had spent a major part of his life as a bureaucrat, most of them in Justice, most in politics? Justice alleges harrassment, you've been through all of this before, etc. You'll not only be thrown out of court but you'll prejudice every such case that goes before that court thereafter.

I preface what follows with the assurance it is not intended as insult. You have to come to undertand that with this stuff you are out of college, no longer a boy, in a very grim man's world. This is a large jump than you realize. It is a major change in life and its realities. But it is the realities with which you have to cope. One of these has nothing at all to do with legalities. It is timing. I am, legally, in an unassailable position and long have been with regard to a number of FOI suits of which the two I've referred to above are only examples. I think I have pursued these things with some care. I do not think it is impossible that I have erred, but I do not think I have. Jim will tell you that all I am doing is keeping my options open and I have refused to do more. (Again, I am <u>not</u> setting one standard for you and another for me.)

In referring to your blindness I am again not intending insult. But one of the many elements that relates to timing is something about which you have persisted in refusing to see, which I regard as a bigger handicap than not being able to. It is the quite predictable consequences - I do say accurately predicted - of the Cyril,Ned, Sylvia, CIA get-Kennedy, play-into-their-hands adventure. If you read my court filings in the clothing suit, you should remember that that very long before this ploy I attempted to address that particular handicap imposed on us now even more because of this common stupidity.

I think I have addressed everything you have enabled me to address except your personal relations. That is your affair. I have made as clear as I can that mine are also my affair. I could put this on a friend-of-my enemy basis with regard to some you enumerate without telling you anything you don't know. I do not. Whether you kid around like a boy or become a man in something besides pubic and facial hair is your affair. You prefer papier-mache trees in Dealey Plaza, removed during the dark of electric lights and the absence of the throngs that were there, prefer it. You prefer those secretly-dug Brown and Root tunnels, prefer. You prefer madness and irresponsibility and futility and you do no more than exercise a Constitutional right. Take that "ast train from Dealey Plaza. But ask yourself where it will take you. Lean on the Whoring Burke Marshalls with Ned and his CIA outfit and with the help of the CIA-defender Katzenbach, and you'll do no more than what you have every legal right to do, pile more shit for us to try to circumvent. You would, I think, do better to talk to yourself. I also think you would do better not to talke even to yourself, as you wonder, if you are in the frame of mind and do the kind of "thinking" you reflect in your letters. It doesn't require salt, it requires mature thinking.

My own course I have made clear. Unless there is something you really think needs further explanation for your understanding, I am finished with all of this. What I do not detect is any sign that you have really done any thinking. You defend and fanatisize.

I keep telling myself I can't afford to be our fireman, as I have been from the first. My survival any way you take this word, is more in jeopardy then it has ever been. The financial problems by themselves are too much. As fast and as cleanly as I feel I can without abdicating the responsibilities my conscience and my year impose upon me I am divorcing myself from all others. When I am faced with where tomorrow's bread is coming from and whether this month I'm going to be able to give the bank what it takes to keep them from taking my home, it is a foolish luxury for me to take time to try and remove the blinders from your eyes or, as I know you will resent, the diapers from your mind. Sorry,